

### Remarks

In the office action mailed May 5, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 10, 21, 25-26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being allegedly obvious over a combination of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0203855 (Veersamy), U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0090947 (Brooks), and U.S. Patent No. 6,459,695 (Schmitt). The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being allegedly obvious over a combination of Veersamy, Brooks, Schmitt, and U.S. Patent No. 6,343,216 (Kim). The Examiner rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being allegedly obvious over a combination of Veersamy, Brooks, Schmitt, and U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0042260 (Saucedo).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the cited references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. (MPEP § 2142). Within all of the asserted combinations of references, the Examiner relies on Schmitt for teaching determining a call-drop location responsive to the base station making a determination that the call has been dropped, in an effort to render the present claims obvious. (Office Action, 5.5.06, p. 3). Applicant submits that none of the asserted references, including Schmitt, teaches or suggests “responsive to the base station making the determination that the call has been dropped, determining a call-drop location of the mobile station,” as in claim 1 and similarly in claims 21, and 28-29.

Schmitt teaches a system to determine areas of hot or dead spots within a communication system. Schmitt teaches that a number of failed call attempts, dropped calls and the like are measured. The identification and location of a wireless station are recorded at selected points during a call, so that if a high number of uncompleted, dropped or handed off calls are recorded, the base station uses the last known location of the wireless stations to circumscribe an area in

which the hot or dead spot occurs. (Col. 1, lines 56-67). Thus, Schmitt teaches that upon determining that a threshold number of calls have been dropped, the base station looks to last known locations of the wireless stations handling the dropped calls. Applicants submit that Schmitt does not teach or suggest “responsive to the base station making the determination that the call has been dropped, [then] determining a call-drop location of the mobile station,” as in claim 1. See also claim 21 (“responsive to making the determination that the call in which the mobile station was engaged has been dropped, cause position determining equipment (PDE) to determine a call-drop location of the mobile station”), Claim 28 (“a second routine to cause position determining equipment (PDE) to determine a call-drop location of the mobile station in response to the first routine making the determination that the call in which the mobile station was engaged has been dropped”) and similarly in claim 29.

The Examiner cited to column 4, lines 1-5 in Schmitt as teaching this claim limitation. The section cited describes the process of identifying the hot or dead spots, and particularly states that “if the number [of dropped calls] is above the threshold, then it is possible a hole has been identified in the area. Processing moves to box 308 where an approximate location of each wireless station is determined when the call was dropped.” And, as Schmitt stated above, the base station determines the approximate location of each wireless station from the last known location of the wireless station. Thus, the process taught in Schmitt does not cause position determining equipment (PDE) to determine a call-drop location of the mobile station responsive to making the determination that the call has been dropped. Rather, Schmitt teaches that the location of the wireless station has already been determined and stored, so that after determining that the threshold number of calls have been dropped, the base station can look up the last known locations of the wireless stations.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Schmitt does not teach or suggest “responsive to making the determination that the call in which the mobile station was engaged has been dropped, cause position determining equipment (PDE) to determine a call-drop location of the mobile station,” as in claim 21, or “a second routine to cause position determining equipment (PDE) to determine a call-drop location of the mobile station in response to the first routine making the determination that the call in which the mobile station was engaged has been dropped,” as in claim 28 and similarly in claim 29.


In addition, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 9 and then canceled claim 9. Applicant submits that none of the asserted combinations of references teach or suggest “wherein the base station determines that no call-drop event has occurred if a duration of good frames are received at the base station from the mobile station within a predefined period of time after receiving the duration of bad frames,” as in claim 1. The Examiner cited to Kim as teaching that a call drop is declared if a predetermined number of consecutive bad frames are received (Office Action, 5.5.06, p. 7). However, Kim does not teach determining that no call-drop event occurs if good frames are subsequently received.

Applicant submits that since none of the asserted combinations of references teach or suggest all of the limitations within any of independent claims 1, 21, or 28-29, the asserted combinations of references do not render the present claims obvious. Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-3331.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDonnell, Boehnen, Hulbert, and Berghoff LLP**

Dated: 8/7/06

By:   
Joseph A. Herndon  
Reg. No. 50,469